

24. (new) A step and platform for use on a ladder as in claim 18 having,
a rung engaging mechanism attached to the a third transversally extending member
for engaging a rung on the ladder.

25. (new) A step and platform for use on a ladder as in claim 19 having,
a rung engaging mechanism attached to the a third transversally extending member
for engaging a rung on the ladder.

26. (new) A step and platform for use on a ladder as in claim 22 having,
the a rung engaging mechanism comprises a retractable pin extending through the
third transversally extending member.

27. (new) A step and platform for use on a ladder as in claim 23 having,
the a rung engaging mechanism comprises a retractable pin extending through the
third transversally extending member.

28. (new) A step and platform for use on a ladder as in claim 24 having,
the a rung engaging mechanism comprises a retractable pin extending through the
third transversally extending member.

29. (new) A step and platform for use on a ladder as in claim 25 having,
the a rung engaging mechanism comprises a retractable pin extending through the
third transversally extending member.

REMARKS

The structure of the claims as amended shows a basic structure of two parallel members, with cross members extending beyond the parallel members one on the top and one on the bottom of the parallel members sort of like rail road ties extending beyond the rail except on tie is on top of the rail and one tie is on the bottom of the rails. Both ties are at one end of the rails but spaced apart, and a cross member is at the other end of the rails between the rails.

This structure is not found in the references. With the rail road tie analogy carried forward for ease of understanding:

Newman does not have the ties 18, 20 extending beyond the rails 12, 14 nor spaced apart longitudinally.

Wirth only has one tie 6 extending beyond the rails 7 on one side and inclined abutments or walls 10 on the other side of the rails. The ties (if the wall can be considered a tie) are not spaced apart on the rails but on opposing sides.

Hornung is a more complicated structure the first tie (platform extension 50 is at one end of the rails, 24 but the second tie on the opposite side of the rail is not proximate the first tie and has intervening structure of braces since it is not on the rails.

Lunn has rails 43 and ties 41 and 53 on opposite sides of the rails but they are not proximal to each other at one end of the rail and they have a considerable amount of intervening structure such as triangular braces, not found in the claims under examination.


Evans has transverse ties 12 and 13 on opposite sides of the rails 10, 11 but they do not extend out beyond the sides of the rails and they are not proximal to each other.

Since none of the cited structures have the features claimed in the claims as amended the applicant believes the claims are all allowable over the prior art cited. Since a unique structure is claimed. The structure when read in light of the specification for the way it is attached to and used with a ladder is very different from all of the references cited.

It is believed that all the claims as now presented are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.



Steven E. Kahm
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30860
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612-339-7461